

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/682,134	LUICK, DAVID ARNOLD
	Examiner Tonia L. Meonske	Art Unit 2181

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tonia L. Meonske. (3) _____
 (2) Bret J. Petersen. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 25 July 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 9-15 and 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Terzian US Patent 4,831,623.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Tonia L. Meonske

David L. Meonske

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner clarified how the Terzian reference reads on the claims. Examiner pointed out the differences between the prior art and the actual invention.

Examiner proposed adding the following concepts into the language of claim 21 to potentially overcome the prior art: in line 11 insert ", where the active thread is different than the selected thread", in line 13, change "a context switch" to "the context switch", in line 15, change "a context switch" to "the context switch in a single clock cycle", in lines 2, 4, and 9, change the limitation "a plurality of" to "at least three" and in line 13, insert "at least three" before the limitation "secondary latches".

Applicant agreed to cancel claims 9-15 and incorporate the language into the claim 21 via an Examiner's Amendment so the case may be allowed.